

**From:** <pdeluca@bowdoin.edu>  
**To:** DC.CMGI(AKitey)  
**Date:** Tue, Sep 5, 2000 4:40 PM  
**Subject:** Regulation of Home Taping

FROM:

NAME: Paul DeLuca  
ADDRESS: 108 Smith Union  
Brunswick, ME 04011

This message was sent to:

Dear Chairman

\*\*\*\*\*

Copy of message text follows:

\*\*\*\*\*

I'm deeply concerned by recent efforts to place copy protection schemes on new home recording/playback devices. Home taping of TV programs has been legally allowable since the mid-80s, with no detriment to the content providers. Changing this is a further removal of public freedoms along the same lines of the same industry's efforts to ban the DeCSS program, but with much more far-reaching consequences. The minor inconvenience of a few hundred thousand people having to acquire a dedicated DVD player does not compare to the sudden loss of the ability, for many million Americans, to record and play back content they have paid for on equipment they own. Perhaps the next step will be to encrypt the public airwaves to prevent unauthorized taping of songs from the radio. I trust that you will recognize this effort for the corporate theft of individual freedom that it is, and rule such 'copy-protection' schemes inadmissible.

Sincerely,

Paul DeLuca

**From:** <minter@lunenburg.org>  
**To:** DC.CMGI(AKitey)  
**Date:** Tue, Sep 5, 2000 4:40 PM  
**Subject:** PP Docket No. 00-67

FROM:

NAME: Wade Minter  
ADDRESS: 1728 MacAlpine Cir.  
Morrisville, NC 27560

This message was sent to:

Dear Chairman

\*\*\*\*\*

Copy of message text follows:

\*\*\*\*\*

I understand the Commission soon will be deciding whether VCRs can be hooked up to digital cable systems, and whether home recording from digital cable will be allowed. Hollywood studios apparently claim that home recording is the same as theft of service and that this justifies limiting home taping. Your agency should protect consumers' rights to record and view DTV signals. The Commission should respect the Supreme Court's ruling in the Betamax case, and not equate private, noncommercial home recording with theft of service! In short, the Commission should take action to protect the interests of consumers in this proceeding.

We are coming to a crossroads in terms of the freedoms that citizens have to control their own property. Cases like this threaten to strip away a person's right to do what they wish with products that they have legally obtained. A person's right to record television programs has been set forth by the Supreme Court - if the MPAA and their ilk get their way, these rights will be rendered moot. I urge you to stand up for the rights of citizens, and fight back against corporate greed.

Sincerely,  
H. Wade Minter  
Morrisville, NC

**From:** <pshay1@home.com>  
**To:** DC.CMGI(AKitey)  
**Date:** Tue, Sep 5, 2000 4:41 PM  
**Subject:** PP Docket No. 00-67

FROM:

NAME: peter shay  
ADDRESS: 717 N. Williams  
Mesa, AZ 85203

This message was sent to:

Dear Chairman

\*\*\*\*\*

Copy of message text follows:

\*\*\*\*\*

I understand the Commission soon will be deciding whether VCRs can be hooked up to digital cable systems, and whether home recording from digital cable will be allowed. Hollywood studios apparently claim that home recording is the same as theft of service and that this justifies limiting home taping. Your agency should protect consumers' rights to record and view DTV signals. The Commission should respect the Supreme Court's ruling in the Betamax case, and not equate private, noncommercial home recording with theft of service! In short, the Commission should take action to protect the interests of consumers in this proceeding. Thank you for reading my views.

Please, stop the insane all-out assault that has been launched by the MPAA and RIAA against consumers.

Most Sincerely,  
Peter Shay  
(a discouraged citizen and consumer)

**From:** <the\_grope@hotmail.com>  
**To:** DC.CMGI(AKitey)  
**Date:** Tue, Sep 5, 2000 4:42 PM  
**Subject:** PP Docket No. 00-67

FROM:

NAME: Robert Grochowski  
ADDRESS: 1520 Ports O'Call Drive  
Plano, TX 75075

This message was sent to:

Dear Chairman

\*\*\*\*\*

Copy of message text follows:

\*\*\*\*\*

I understand the Commission soon will be deciding whether VCRs can be hooked up to digital cable systems, and whether home recording from digital cable will be allowed. Hollywood studios apparently claim that home recording is the same as theft of service and that this justifies limiting home taping. Your agency should protect consumers' rights to record and view DTV signals. The Commission should respect the Supreme Court's ruling in the Betamax case, and not equate private, noncommercial home recording with theft of service! In short, the Commission should take action to protect the interests of consumers in this proceeding.

It is NOT the business of Government to turn law abiding American citizens into criminals. We are, once again, at the mercy of small, special interest groups, whose greed overshadows their common sense. Don't let this happen ... again.

Thank you for reading my views.

Robert Grochowski

**From:** <griffjon@hotmail.com>  
**To:** DC.CMGI(AKitey)  
**Date:** Tue, Sep 5, 2000 4:42 PM  
**Subject:** PP Docket No. 00-67

FROM:

NAME: Jon Camfield  
ADDRESS: 1016 Camino La Costa 607  
Austin, TX 78752

This message was sent to:

Dear Chairman

\*\*\*\*\*

Copy of message text follows:

\*\*\*\*\*

I understand the Commission soon will be deciding whether VCRs can be hooked up to digital cable systems, and whether home recording from digital cable will be allowed.

Consumers have already paid a premium price for the digital signals--and are probably leaders in adopting the new technology. These consumers should not be penalized for doing so. Consumers should not be slaves to their TVs to catch shows that they cannot be present for at time-of-broadcast. Time-shifting is and has been ruled as fully within fair-use.

Hollywood studios apparently claim that home recording is the same as theft of service and that this justifies limiting home taping. Your agency should protect consumers' rights to record and view DTV signals. The Commission should respect the Supreme Court's ruling in the Betamax case, and not equate private, noncommercial home recording with theft of service! In short, the Commission should take action to protect the interests of consumers in this proceeding.

Thank you for reading my views,

Jon Camfield  
GriffJon@Hotmail.com

**From:** <tb@aracnet.com>  
**To:** DC.CMGI(AKitey)  
**Date:** Tue, Sep 5, 2000 4:43 PM  
**Subject:** PP Docket No. 00-67

FROM:

NAME: Anthony Booker  
ADDRESS: 16194 NW Ramona Drive  
Beaverton, OR 97006

This message was sent to:

Dear Chairman

\*\*\*\*\*

Copy of message text follows:

\*\*\*\*\*

I understand the Commission soon will be deciding whether VCRs can be hooked up to digital cable systems, and whether home recording from digital cable will be allowed.

I realise that as a resident alien my opinion is worthless but I'm going to give it anyway.

This matter would seem to have been decided already. I own a device that I purchased to achieve this effect for the current technology.

The argument that it is different now because the signal is digital instead of analog is specious and should not be allowed to stand.

I believe that the concept of corporations was to make them serve the market not dictate legislation of the public interest.

In short I feel that the requirement to add hardware to prevent legitimate use of recording devices is wrong, please don't allow it.

Thank you for reading my views.

Sincerely,  
Anthony Booker

**From:** <michael.chermside@destiny.com>  
**To:** DC.CMGI(AKitey)  
**Date:** Tue, Sep 5, 2000 4:43 PM  
**Subject:** PP Docket No. 00-67

FROM:

NAME: Michael Chermside  
ADDRESS: 5715 North Ridge Ave  
Chicago, IL 60660

This message was sent to:

Dear Chairman

\*\*\*\*\*

Copy of message text follows:

\*\*\*\*\*

I have read recent reports that the FCC is accepting public comment on the subject of the recording and taping of Digital TV signals. As a citizen, I wish to express my concern that increasingly, legal means are being used by large and wealthy corporations to impose unnecessary and intrusive restrictions on the behavior of ordinary citizens. I do not believe that the ability for citizens to tape programs off a video or cable tv feed is in any danger of undermining the copyright system in the US... as 20 years of experience with home VCRs has convincingly demonstrated. Weigh this non-existent threat then, against the intrusive request that the cable distributors and the owners of the content be able to effectively restrict a citizen's right to control their own television. Please consider the citizen's position in this issue.

I would like to express my willingness to speak further on this issue, and to testify in writing or in person if my input would be desired. Please contact me at michael.chermside@destiny.com or 773-271-2973.

-- Michael Chermside  
5715 North Ridge Ave  
Chicago IL 60660

**From:** <david\_schuetz@tds.com>  
**To:** DC.CMGI(AKitey)  
**Date:** Tue, Sep 5, 2000 4:44 PM  
**Subject:** PP Docket No. 00-67

FROM:

NAME: David Schuetz  
ADDRESS: 14600 Indian Summer Court  
Centreville, VA 20120

This message was sent to:

Dear Chairman

\*\*\*\*\*

Copy of message text follows:

\*\*\*\*\*

I understand the Commission soon will be deciding whether VCRs can be hooked up to digital cable systems, and whether home recording from digital cable will be allowed. Hollywood studios apparently claim that home recording is the same as theft of service and that this justifies limiting home taping. Your agency should protect consumers' rights to record and view DTV signals. The Commission should respect the Supreme Court's ruling in the Betamax case, and not equate private, noncommercial home recording with theft of service! In short, the Commission should take action to protect the interests of consumers in this proceeding. Thank you for reading my views.

----

I understand that copyright laws are in place to prevent people from making illegal profit from other people's work, but I fail to see how that law should be applied to in-home recording for time-shifting or later viewing. Regardless of the arguments about a "Digital VCR creating a perfect copy", any copy that I record will still be minus the liner notes, special features, etc., that I'd be able to get from a purchased DVD.

If the MPAA wants to prevent piracy of their works, they should go after the people who are actually breaking \*that\* law, producing/selling illegal copies of movies. They should not be reducing the rights of home users who are not breaking any laws.

A whole new class of consumer product, the digital computer "Personal TV" device (TiVO and ReplayTV) has recently come into being -- such restrictions as the MPAA proposes, even "we'll only enable it when we really want to" restrictions, could destroy this new product line, and anything like it in the future.

If you would like to see other views, please read the discussion on Slashdot

Thank you, again, for your time.

david.

(<http://slashdot.org/comments.pl?sid=00%2F09%2F05%2F2114201&cid=&pid=0&threshold=3&mode=nested>). The discussion may occasionally seem a little digressive, but I'm certain that you will find many well-written comments that should help in your decision.

**From:** <baschulman@earthlink.net>  
**To:** DC.CMGI(AKitey)  
**Date:** Tue, Sep 5, 2000 4:45 PM  
**Subject:** PP Docket No. 00-67

FROM:

NAME: Brady Schulman  
ADDRESS: 4 Daniels Farm Rd., PMB-234  
Trumbull, CT 06611

This message was sent to:

Dear Chairman

\*\*\*\*\*

Copy of message text follows:

\*\*\*\*\*

I understand the Commission soon will be deciding whether VCRs can be hooked up to digital cable systems, and whether home recording from digital cable will be allowed. Hollywood studios apparently claim that home recording is the same as theft of service and that this justifies limiting home taping. Your agency should protect consumers' rights to record and view DTV signals. The Commission should respect the Supreme Court's ruling in the Betamax case, and not equate private, noncommercial home recording with theft of service! In short, the Commission should take action to protect the interests of consumers in this proceeding. Thank you for reading my views.

When considering the many restrictions already placed upon consumers and digital media, please remember that the majority of these were for the purpose of protecting against copies of originals, not broadcast material. I think it's very disturbing that with the greatest potential formats comes the most restrictive proposed laws.

With all hope for a freedom based future,

Brady

**From:** <Steve@burnap.net>  
**To:** DC.CMGI(AKitey)  
**Date:** Tue, Sep 5, 2000 4:45 PM  
**Subject:** PP Docket No. 00-67

FROM:

NAME: Steven Burnap  
ADDRESS: 1803 Second Ave  
Walnut Creek, CA 94596

This message was sent to:

Dear Chairman

\*\*\*\*\*

Copy of message text follows:

\*\*\*\*\*

I understand the Commission soon will be deciding whether VCRs can be hooked up to digital cable systems, and whether home recording from digital cable will be allowed. Hollywood studios apparently claim that home recording is the same as theft of service and that this justifies limiting home taping. Your agency should protect consumers' rights to record and view DTV signals. The Commission should respect the Supreme Court's ruling in the Betamax case, and not equate private, noncommercial home recording with theft of service! In short, the Commission should take action to protect the interests of consumers in this proceeding.

Enough of the form letter. To say it in my own words, it seems as if certain corporations hold the mistaken view that the public airwaves are not public, but are instead owned by them. As we all know, this is not the case. Restrictions are put on the use of the airwaves only in order to prevent uses not in the use of the public and not, as many of these large corporations seem to think, in order to enhance their profits. Enhancing of profits is fine, as long as it is done in a fair manner. It is not fine when it crosses into anti-social territory.

In the past, both the courts and the FCC have taken a reasonable, balanced view, not trampling on the rights of the the true owners of the airwaves while also preventing the sort of anarchy that would prevent individuals and corporations from being fairly compensated for their creations. It is my hope that both the FCC and the courts will continue to find that balance, protecting profits, but not at the expense of completely reasonable use of the airwaves by private citizens.

And in my mind, that fair and reasonable use is quite simply. If I pay, either explicitly, or implicitly through watching advertising, for signals to be sent to my house, I have the right to view those signals in any way and at any time that I see fit, provided I do not transfer those signals to someone who hasn't so paid. That is fair and reasonable. It imposes no onus on the private citizen and yet provides a fair profit to the creator of those signals.

Thank you for reading my views.

Sincerely,

Steven R. Burnap

**From:** <bstephan5@home.com>  
**To:** DC.CMGI(AKitey)  
**Date:** Tue, Sep 5, 2000 4:47 PM  
**Subject:** PP Docket No. 00-67

FROM:

NAME: Byron Stephan  
ADDRESS: 3217 Maple Lane  
Harrisburg, PA 17110

This message was sent to:

Dear Chairman

\*\*\*\*\*

Copy of message text follows:

\*\*\*\*\*

I understand the Commission soon will be deciding whether VCRs can be hooked up to digital cable systems, and whether home recording from digital cable will be allowed. Hollywood studios apparently claim that home recording is the same as theft of service and that this justifies limiting home taping. Your agency should protect consumers' rights to record and view DTV signals. The Commission should respect the Supreme Court's ruling in the Betamax case, and not equate private, noncommercial home recording with theft of service! In short, the Commission should take action to protect the interests of consumers in this proceeding. Thank you for reading my views.

And why is that the VCR was going to beggar the movie industry but has somehow made them far more money. Are they really this shortsightedly stupid?

Sincerely,

Byron Stephan

**From:** <intuc@azstarnet.com>  
**To:** DC.CMGI(AKitey)  
**Date:** Tue, Sep 5, 2000 4:49 PM  
**Subject:** PP Docket No. 00-67

FROM:

NAME: Charles Falkenbach  
ADDRESS: 10665 E. Barclay Park Loop  
Tucson, AZ 85748

This message was sent to:

Dear Chairman

\*\*\*\*\*

Copy of message text follows:

\*\*\*\*\*

I understand the Commission soon will be deciding whether VCRs can be hooked up to digital cable systems, and whether home recording from digital cable will be allowed. Hollywood studios apparently claim that home recording is the same as theft of service and that this justifies limiting home taping.

Your agency should protect consumers' rights to record and view DTV signals. The Commission should respect the Supreme Court's ruling in the Betamax case, and not equate private, noncommercial home recording with theft of service! In short, the Commission should take action to protect the interests of consumers in this proceeding.

If I can not "time shift" programs so I can watch them when it is convenient, I just won't watch them. The networks will then loose a viewer.

Thank you for considering my views.

Sincerely,

Charles Falkenbach

**From:** <sean@goller.net>  
**To:** DC.CMGI(AKitey)  
**Date:** Tue, Sep 5, 2000 4:49 PM  
**Subject:** PP Docket No. 00-67

FROM:

NAME: Sean Goller  
ADDRESS: 1657 Yale Place  
Rockville, MD 20850

This message was sent to:

Dear Chairman

\*\*\*\*\*

Copy of message text follows:

\*\*\*\*\*

I understand the Commission soon will be deciding whether VCRs can be hooked up to digital cable systems, and whether home recording from digital cable will be allowed. Hollywood studios apparently claim that home recording is the same as theft of service and that this justifies limiting home taping. Your agency should protect consumers' rights to record and view DTV signals. The Commission should respect the Supreme Court's ruling in the Betamax case, and not equate private, noncommercial home recording with theft of service! In short, the Commission should take action to protect the interests of consumers in this proceeding. Thank you for reading my views.

I realize that for the most part this is boiler plate from the Home Recording Rights Coalition, but the fact remains that I share these viewpoints and wish to be heard. As a radio DJ, I appreciate the hard job the FCC has regulating the airwaves, and hope they come to a decision that protects consumer's rights. Thanks again for hearing my comment.

-Sean Goller.

**From:** <hobson@awh.zzn.com>  
**To:** DC.CMGI(AKitey)  
**Date:** Tue, Sep 5, 2000 4:50 PM  
**Subject:** Right to Record

FROM:

NAME: Andrei Hobson  
ADDRESS: 7045 Rhapsody Ct.  
Sun Valley, NV 89433

This message was sent to:

Dear Chairman

\*\*\*\*\*

Copy of message text follows:

\*\*\*\*\*

It has come to my attention recently that there have been a number of attempts to change and some court rulings that effect change to the copyright laws. It is my understanding that one such change is being sought by the MPAA to block or limit the amount of recording, using a VCR, that can be done from TV, specifically the new digital models being promoted.

This topic was discussed when the original VCRs where created, and at that time the decision was made that for our personal use, we might copy anything from the TV airways or cable and view at a different time. In no way was the time or quality of the recording limited in any fashion. I understand that digital bradcasting means the potential for digital copying, but based on the fact that the laws currently in effect specifically state that these copies must be used only for personal viewing, why the need to limit the scope of time or quality being recorded?

It is my understanding that the stations were given equivalent bandwith of the digital wavelength as they had/have of the current TV wavelength. IF this is accurate, then they have effectively received more channels for the same space due to the compression digital is capable of sustaining without loss of quality. More channels=more revenue potential. Why then are they worried about the average person copying a show?

Thank you,  
Andrei Hobson

**From:** <haplo@epithna.com>  
**To:** DC.CMGI(AKitey)  
**Date:** Tue, Sep 5, 2000 4:52 PM  
**Subject:** Taping TV

FROM:

NAME: Bill Dunn  
ADDRESS: 20 Pollier Way  
Auburn, MA 01501

This message was sent to:

Dear Chairman

\*\*\*\*\*

Copy of message text follows:

\*\*\*\*\*

DO not change the rules on this I should be able to tape anything I want so that I can watch it later. I am not always home, in fact i rarely am when TV shows or Movies that i want to watch are on....it is my right to tpae these so that I can delay watching them until a convinent time.

Please remember also that the desires of big bussines rarely benifit the consumer and there corprate types are not what the laws, and ideals of the constitution are ment to protect its me, that its ment to protect.

Thank You,  
Bill Dunn

**From:** <mfranklin@homestead-inc.com>  
**To:** DC.CMGI(AKitey)  
**Date:** Tue, Sep 5, 2000 4:53 PM  
**Subject:** PP Docket No. 00-67

FROM:

NAME: Matthew Franklin  
ADDRESS: 1200 Dale Ave #112  
Mountain View, CA 94040

This message was sent to:

Dear Chairman

\*\*\*\*\*

Copy of message text follows:

\*\*\*\*\*

I am shocked that there will even be some discussion about my ability to record digital cable programming in my own home, even for the purpose of time-shifting. The highly aggressive broadcasting corporations can hardly be expected to limit the use of non-recordable programming "on their honor". I hope that the Commission respects the ruling of the Supreme Court in the Betamax case, and protects the rights of consumers in this proceeding.

Sincerely,  
Matthew Franklin

**From:** <cpt.k@usa.net>  
**To:** DC.CMGI(AKitey)  
**Date:** Tue, Sep 5, 2000 4:55 PM  
**Subject:** PP Docket No. 00-67

FROM:

NAME: Joshua Stratton  
ADDRESS: 13716 NE 11th St  
Bellevue, WA 98005

This message was sent to:

Dear Chairman

\*\*\*\*\*

Copy of message text follows:

\*\*\*\*\*

It has come to my attention that the FCC will soon be deciding whether or not VCRs attached to digital cable systems will be legally able to record transmissions.

Frankly, it is appalling that this question should even have to be asked. Of course it is legal. If Sony v. Universal were not clear enough, I would like you, and the other members deciding this issue to ask yourself the following question: How does progressively restricting things from viewers; forcing people to pay for materials that are effectively copyrighted in perpetuity every single time they wish to view them; how does this serve the SINGLE purpose of copyrights in the US, as explicitly defined by the Constitution? The definition is that copyrights are only valid insofar as they promote the advancement of the arts. This has consistently been interpreted by the Supreme Court to mean that the interests of copyright holders are a distant, distant second to that of the public at large.

Does the inability to exercise constitutionally protected rights serve a public interest more than it serves that of copyright holders? I think not.

Your duty is clear. Recording must be protected.

Sincerely, Joshua Stratton

**From:** <j\_gibson@iname.com>  
**To:** DC.CMGI(AKitey)  
**Date:** Tue, Sep 5, 2000 8:27 PM  
**Subject:** Restricting VCRs

FROM:

NAME: John Gibson  
ADDRESS: 2400 Durant Ave., Ida Sproul Hall, Room 601  
Berkeley, CA 94720

This message was sent to:

Dear Chairman

\*\*\*\*\*

Copy of message text follows:

\*\*\*\*\*

I am writing to comment on the upcoming ruling about disabling the recording function of VCRs and other devices for specific Digital Broadcasts. I strongly object to this proposal. While I see the need for companies to protect their intellectual property, I am worried that these restrictions will be expanded to prevent me from recording any program. This would be an extreme inconvenience, as I would no longer be able to record for time-shifting purposes. It would also require me to buy expensive, new equipment to be compatible with the system. Please do not force manufacturers to place these restrictions into their products.

Sincerely,

John Gibson

**From:** <dlandis@scubatech.com>  
**To:** DC.CMGI(AKitey)  
**Date:** Tue, Sep 5, 2000 7:53 PM  
**Subject:** PP Docket No. 00-67

FROM:

NAME: Don Landis  
ADDRESS: 5043 Spring Glen Rd.  
Jacksonville, FL 32207

This message was sent to:

Dear Chairman

\*\*\*\*\*

Copy of message text follows:

\*\*\*\*\*

I understand the Commission soon will be deciding whether VCRs can be hooked up to digital cable and/or Digital broadcast satellite systems, and whether home recording from digital cable or DBS will be allowed. Hollywood studios apparently claim that home recording for personal use is the same as theft of service and that this justifies limiting home taping. Your agency should protect consumers' rights to record and view DTV signals. The Commission should respect the Supreme Court's ruling in the Betamax case, and not equate private, noncommercial home recording with theft of service! In short, the Commission should take action to protect the interests of consumers in this proceeding. Thank you for reading my views.

My vote in November will be decided based on the actions of this administration being a government of the people and for the people or for special business interests and kick back money.

Don Landis

**From:** <maynard@jmg.com>  
**To:** DC.CMGI(AKitey)  
**Date:** Tue, Sep 5, 2000 7:54 PM  
**Subject:** PP Docket No. 00-67

FROM:

NAME: J. Maynard Gelinas  
ADDRESS: 305 Washington St. Apt #1  
Cambridge, MA 02139

This message was sent to:

Dear Chairman

\*\*\*\*\*

Copy of message text follows:

\*\*\*\*\*

This note is in regard to the MPAA and the proposed requirement that hardware manufacturers of digital video equipment include copy protection measures which would prevent recording public television and replaying at a later time. This removes one of my "fair use" rights as a citizen. I emlore you to ask these questions when forming policy:

Will citizens be able to copy for citation and quote for critique?

Will citizens be prevented from make collage art out of video snippets broadcast from across the world via satellite?

Will citizens be allowed to record for the historical record?

An you might ask yourself, what the hell will happen to non-commercial "fair use?"

J. Maynard Gelinas

-----

Here are the pre-canned words hrcc.org suggests I say:

-----

I understand the Commission soon will be deciding whether VCRs can be hooked up to digital cable systems, and whether home recording from digital cable will be allowed. Hollywood studios apparently claim that home recording is the same as theft of service and that this justifies limiting home taping. Your agency should protect consumers' rights to record and view DTV signals. The Commission should respect the Supreme Court's ruling in the Betamax case, and not equate private, noncommercial home recording with theft of service! In short, the Commission should take action to protect the interests of consumers in this proceeding. Thank you for reading my views.

**From:** <jsheldon@cats.ucsc.edu>  
**To:** DC.CMGI(AKitey)  
**Date:** Tue, Sep 5, 2000 7:57 PM  
**Subject:** PP Docket No. 00-67

FROM:

NAME: James Sheldon  
ADDRESS: 5335 Meridian Ave  
San Jose, CA 95118

This message was sent to:

Dear Chairman

\*\*\*\*\*

Copy of message text follows:

\*\*\*\*\*

I understand the Commission soon will be deciding whether VCRs can be hooked up to digital cable systems, and whether home recording from digital cable will be allowed.

The ability to have home recording capabilities is important to be as a cable customer. I may want to save a program to watch again in the future, or watch a program at a different time if I'm not home or busy.

Some Hollywood studios apparently claim that home recording is the same as theft of service and that this justifies limiting home taping.

The FCC should protect consumers' rights to record and view DTV signals. The Commission should respect the Supreme Court's ruling in the Betamax case, and ensure that the right to private, noncommercial recording is protected.

Thank you.

**From:** <andy@mail.aburns.com>  
**To:** DC.CMGI(AKitey)  
**Date:** Tue, Sep 5, 2000 8:06 PM  
**Subject:** Request for FCC to rule on Copy Protection Technology Dispute

FROM:

NAME: Andrew Burns  
ADDRESS: 2075I Lake Park Dr.  
Smyrna, GA 30080

This message was sent to:

Dear Chairman

\*\*\*\*\*

Copy of message text follows:

\*\*\*\*\*

The ability to time shift my selected entertainment is a boon for me. I am employed in one of the many new high tech fields. As such, I work long hours and am only able to keep abreast of the world through the ability to record current events programs, news and other pop culture items for time shifted viewing.

By placing copy restrictions on my ability to record and handle the recordings to view at a later time or different place forces me to remove myself from the TV viewing public. The restrictions would lessen my ability to view TV.

Please consider the difficulties you would place on people who work non-standard hours who enjoy the ability to, easily and without restriction, time shift their viewing habits.

Sincerely,

Andrew J. Burns

**From:** <mmangino@acm.org>  
**To:** DC.CMGI(AKitey)  
**Date:** Tue, Sep 5, 2000 7:19 PM  
**Subject:** Right to record digital cable

FROM:

NAME: Mike Mangino  
ADDRESS: 707 Vista Dr  
Gahanna, OH 43230

This message was sent to:

Dear Chairman

\*\*\*\*\*

Copy of message text follows:

\*\*\*\*\*

I recently read an article that deeply disturbs me. According to the news media, the Motion Picture Association of America is trying to take away my ability to record television programs. This concerns me for several reasons. My primary reason is that I work in the field of computer science. I work 80 to 100 hours a week. This has the unfortunate side effect that I sometimes miss the one or two programs that I enjoy watching. I bought a VCR for the sole reason of being able to record programming for watching later.

My second concern regards the motivations for this action by the MPAA. Once again, it appears that the MPAA is trying to make an accepted legal practice illegal. It appears that the MPAA wants people to pay money every time they watch a movie or any other program. I understand their desire, however I feel they are out of touch. If I buy a movie service such as HBO, I expect to be able to watch the movies on the service. If I am unable to watch a movie when it is on, I expect to record it for watching later. In my opinion, I am only receiving the service I paid for. I feel the same goes for pay per view events. I love boxing, yet I am not always able to watch the events when they are broadcast. Again, I feel that if I pay \$50 for a fight, I should be able to watch it at a later time.

It seems to me that the concern of the MPAA is people who record movies and share them with their friends. While I understand this is a concern, I feel that stopping everybody from recording digital television is overkill. If the MPAA doesn't want people to copy and sell movies from digital cable, I believe that the correct course of action is to prosecute those that break the law.

In closing, I think the MPAA is overreacting again. Just like they have many times in the past. Do you remember when they wanted VCR's to be outlawed because they caused a threat to their revenue stream? Right now, 50% of the MPAA's revenue stream comes from video tape rentals. Please, don't take a useful medium and ruin it in order to shield a company from its own paranoia.

Sincerely,  
Mike Mangino  
Sr. Software Engineer  
SubmitOrder.com

**From:** <ian@cet.com>  
**To:** DC.CMGI(AKitey)  
**Date:** Tue, Sep 5, 2000 7:20 PM  
**Subject:** Recording television shows for later viewing is fair use

FROM:

NAME: Ian Erickson  
ADDRESS: 1807 W Mansfield  
Spokane, WA 99205

This message was sent to:

Dear Chairman

\*\*\*\*\*

Copy of message text follows:

\*\*\*\*\*

I writing to you in regards to the MPAA's request to require built-in copy protection on VCRs and DVD players. I don't think these people fathom that home recording is a legal, practical, and legitimate use of home theater equipment that has nothing to do with piracy.

My wife and I are perfect examples. We work different shifts and don't see much of one another until the weekend. This also means we're rarely home when a given TV show is on. The only way we watch TV (the only way we can) is to program the VCR to collect our shows during the week, then watch them together on the weekend. We're not unique; almost everyone I know at my work (a 500 employee company) does the same. I think there are many others like me as well, especially college students, double income families, and people who travel during the work week.

A side-benefit is we're able to control our kids TV viewing by having the TV antennae-less hooked to a player-only VCR. We help them program the VCR for their shows, so they don't channel-surf away their lives. Recordable VCRs let us do this without goverment or corporate rating systems or V-chips or any other kind of outside assistance.

If you cave in to the MPAA ridiculous request, people like us will not reroute our lives just to watch Survivor. Do you think I would switch\_jobs just to be home for prime time TV?

The meat of their request is not about piracy or home viewing. It's about unfair protection from Digital VCRs like Reply and Tivo. With products like this in place, the on-demand programming offered by digital cable or satellite services is less valuable to consumers. Protecting these conglomerates from market competition isn't the duty of the FCC.

This issue has already been dealt with by the FCC when VCRs first came out. Fair use is still fair use.

**From:** <beej@piratehaven.org>  
**To:** DC.CMGI(AKitey)  
**Date:** Tue, Sep 5, 2000 7:28 PM  
**Subject:** PP Docket No. 00-67

FROM:

NAME: Brian Hall  
ADDRESS: 1710 Walnut St. #229  
Berkeley, CA 94709

This message was sent to:

Dear Chairman

\*\*\*\*\*

Copy of message text follows:

\*\*\*\*\*

I understand that the MPAA wishes antitheft devices to be built into all digital home entertainment equipment.

Unfortunately, if this happens, I lose many of my previously held fair-use rights. As a consumer, for such a sacrifice, I feel I should get something in return, but I do not.

Additionally, I do not wish to pay the cost associated with this device when I purchase a home entertainment system, no matter how small.

I would rather pay extra per viewing (as to offset the cost of piracy) than lose my fair use rights.

I ask you, however obvious this is, to please consider existing consumer rights as more important than MPAA profit margins.

Sincerely,  
Brian E. Hall

**From:** <wolpert@yahoo.com>  
**To:** DC.CMGI(AKitey)  
**Date:** Tue, Sep 5, 2000 7:32 PM  
**Subject:** PP Docket No. 00-67 with personal comments...

FROM:

NAME: Edward Wolpert  
ADDRESS: 6022 West 113 Ave  
Westminster, CO 80020

This message was sent to:

Dear Chairman

\*\*\*\*\*

Copy of message text follows:

\*\*\*\*\*

Below here is the standard text that contains  
HRRC objections to the MPAA restrictions on  
home recording. I agree with them, so I left  
it in this message, but want to add my  
personal comments.

I want to emphasize a growing trend with  
the broadcasting folks (And RIAA) that  
bothers me... they keep forgetting  
fair-use. Too many times are people  
told that because 'theft' can occur, us  
consumers (citizens) should have fair-use  
revoked. This restriction, if passed, is  
yet another attack on the consumers... I've  
already paid enough for the equipment I have  
purchased... now they don't want me to use  
my VCR to tape their shows so I can eat  
dinner when I want?

What makes this worse is one day, in a few  
years, analog broadcasts will be stopped  
in America. That means 'free' airwaves will  
be forced to abide by any new restrictions  
that occur on the 'new digital medium'.  
Regardless of the reason for this, the MPAA  
and others in the industry want to use this  
'event' as a way to convince FCC et al. to  
re-write the laws in commercial favor, and  
not in the consumer/citizen's favor.  
Personally, if this gets too overbearing...  
I'll give up TV, cable or otherwise.

Now... back to the HRCC written letter...

I understand the Commission soon will be deciding whether VCRs can be hooked up  
to digital cable systems, and whether home recording from digital cable will be

allowed. Hollywood studios apparently claim that home recording is the same as theft of service and that this justifies limiting home taping. Your agency should protect consumers' rights to record and view DTV signals. The Commission should respect the Supreme Court's ruling in the Betamax case, and not equate private, noncommercial home recording with theft of service! In short, the Commission should take action to protect the interests of consumers in this proceeding. Thank you for reading my views.

-----  
Virtually,  
Edward Wolpert

**From:** <benjamin@psnw.com>  
**To:** DC.CMGI(AKitey)  
**Date:** Tue, Sep 5, 2000 7:35 PM  
**Subject:** PP Docket No. 00-67

FROM:

NAME: Benjamin Moos  
ADDRESS: 27747 Rd. 140  
Visalia, CA 93292

This message was sent to:

Dear Chairman

\*\*\*\*\*

Copy of message text follows:

\*\*\*\*\*

I understand the Commission soon will be deciding whether VCRs can be hooked up to digital cable systems, and whether home recording from digital cable will be allowed. Hollywood studios apparently claim that home recording is the same as theft of service and that this justifies limiting home taping. Your agency should protect consumers' rights to record and view DTV signals. The Commission should respect the Supreme Court's ruling in the Betamax case, and not equate private, noncommercial home recording with theft of service! In short, the Commission should take action to protect the interests of consumers in this proceeding. Thank you for reading my views.

It is in the nature of all industries and industry groups to seek every protection and advantage they can in the marketplace, to increase their profit potential. While there is a public good in increasing the profit of industry for the good of the economy, there is a conflicting public good in maintaining some limits on these advantages and protections, both to protect consumers from unrestrained pricing and from the erosion of their own natural rights. In my opinion and industry which has a limited arena in which it must act is a more vibrant and vigorous industry, providing more varied and higher quality services, while an unfettered industry, able to buy and cajole its way in public policy, is prone to be stagnant and to offer poor service and limited choice.

Sincerely,  
Benjamin Moos  
A Voting Citizen and a Media Consumer